



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/557,035	04/21/2000	Ryoji Amemiya	SONY-TO488	6480
22850	7590	06/09/2006	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			WANG, JIN CHENG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2628	

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/557,035	Applicant(s) AMEMIYA, RYOJI	
	Examiner Jin-Cheng Wang	Art Unit 2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 20-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 20-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's submissions filed on 4/10/2006 have been entered. Claims 1-17 have been amended. Claims 18-19 have been canceled. The claims 20-23 have been newly added. Claims 1-17 and 20-23 are pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 and 20-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection set forth in the present Office Action.

For example, the base claim 1 recites the two "said displaying direction control means controls the direction of display of said selected image by rotating said selected image when the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen detected by the posture detecting means remains unchanged for a predetermined time." When the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen remains unchanged for a predetermined time, no rotation of the selected image should be performed. This is the case when the display screen has not been rotated that results in the no change of posture of the display screen for a predetermined time.

Moreover, the claim limitation of "when the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen detected by the posture detecting means remains unchanged for a predetermined time" is not described in the specification. Referring to Fig. 12 of applicant's specification, display processing in accordance with angle of rotation only happens after the delay time elapsed. When *the newly detected* second angle of rotation is the same as the first

Art Unit: 2628

angle of rotation within the predetermined delay time, the program execution is still in the loop. Nothing happens and image rotation is not performed. Therefore, the metes and bounds of the coverage of at least base claim 1 cannot be ascertained.

The claim 1 also recites “the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen”. However, the specification describes at most “changes the posture of the information processing apparatus” and “an angular component detecting step of detecting an angular component in a plane parallel with the display surface”. That is the angular component as disclosed is related to the plane parallel with the display surface, rather than the change of posture of the display screen or the posture of the display screen. The posture of the display screen is a vague term and the specification only describes to change the posture of the display screen.

To comply with the “written description” requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, an applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the “written description” inquiry, whatever is now claimed. *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Fed. Cir. 1991). For purposes of written description, one shows “possession” by descriptive means such as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention. *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Such descriptive means cannot be found in the disclosure for the inventions of the base claim 1.

Art Unit: 2628

2. The claims 1-17 and 20-23 are unpatentable based on Martinez et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,137,468 (hereinafter Martinez), and further in view of Hoshino et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,396,506 (hereinafter Hoshino), Robbins et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,326,978 (hereinafter Robbins), and Tabata U.S. Patent No. 5,781,165 (hereinafter Tabata).

For example, Hoshino teaches the claim limitation of “means for setting a first mode in which all of a plurality of separate images configured to be displayed on the display screen are to be rotated, a second mode in which a selected image of the plurality of separate images is to be rotated, and a third mode in which none of the plurality of separate images are to be rotated.” See Figs. 40-46 in relation to Figs. 1-39 and the corresponding specification in which a plurality of windows 350, as shown in Figs. 45-46, are rotated in accordance with the operating buttons 300a-300d of Fig. 40. The rotation of the images depends upon the selection of the operating buttons 300a-300d. Although Fig. 44 only shows one window, multiple windows can be found in Fig. 44 and column 19-20 wherein window B is displayed behind window A on a single display screen 2 and Fig. 46 wherein both windows A and window B are displayed on a single display screen 2. The windows A and B in the single display screen 2 are rotated together by means of the operating buttons 300a-300d and a particular window is rotated by means of the picture direction change buttons 354a-354d and the selector button 355 and the rotate button 356 of Fig. 43 for the particular window A or B to rotate a particular window 350 displayed on Fig. 46. No rotation takes place while no selection request whatsoever on the display screen window 2 or the windows A, B inside the display screen window 2 being made by the user to rotate the images being displayed. Moreover, each window has a single image or a plurality of images such as those shown in Fig. 7c. Hoshino also teaches “means for selecting the selected image when the

Art Unit: 2628

second mode is set” in which Hoshimo teaches selecting the image in window A when the second mode is set, i.e., when the rotation selection is placed on a particular window rather than being placed on the display screen 2).

Martinez discloses in Figs. 8-10 the claim limitation of “displaying direction control means for controlling a direction of display of the selected image by rotating the selected image according to the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen detected by the posture detecting means wherein said displaying direction control means controls the direction of display of said selected image by rotating said selected image when the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen detected by the posture detecting means remains unchanged for a predetermined time.”

This is because Martinez discloses in Fig. 8 a rotate feature that allows “wait” until a selected amount of predefined movement is detected and there is a delay time by the execution of the block 804 before the program execution passes to the block 808 of updating system coordinates table to reflect tilt degree or the block 810 that all windows are redrawn using updated system coordinate table. Moreover, Fig. 10, Martinez discloses a side to side feature wherein the degree of tilt is detected, when the detected degree is within the defined trigger region, i.e., the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen as claimed remains unchanged for a defined amount time in block 1009, the process jumps to block 1010 and further jumps to the block 1022 or 1024 to arrange the windows.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated the Hoshino’s selection means into the Martinez’s display device because Martinez suggests selecting an image (600) to be rotated and selecting an image (602) not to be rotated and

Art Unit: 2628

therefore Martinez suggests the claim limitation of the selection means for selecting an image (See Figures 6A-6C). Martinez teaches selecting an image object such as the window 600 (Figures 6A-6C) to be rotated and not selecting the other image object such as 602. The image objects 600 and 602 are separate image objects, i.e., the image object 602 just overlays on the window 600, but not a part of the window and therefore the image objects 600 and 602 constitute a plurality of image objects as claimed. Martinez therefore teaches rotating one of the plurality of the image objects while not rotating one of the plurality of the image objects.

One having the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would have provided a selection means so that a particular image can be selected to be rotated while other images remain unchanged in response to the display screen orientation (See Martinez Figures 6A-6C) and selection means so that user can manipulate the selected image object (Hoshino Figs. 40-46 and column 19-20; Robbins teaches the means of selecting an image displayed on a window of a plurality of separate images on a plurality of windows configured to be displayed on the display screen; Robbins Figs. 1-2 and column 3-4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-17 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the

Art Unit: 2628

relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

For example, the base claim 1 recites the two “said displaying direction control means controls the direction of display of said selected image by rotating said selected image when the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen detected by the posture detecting means remains unchanged for a predetermined time.” When the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen remains unchanged for a predetermined time, no rotation of the selected image should be performed. This is the case when the display screen has not been rotated that results in the no change of posture of the display screen for a predetermined time.

Moreover, the claim limitation of “when the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen detected by the posture detecting means remains unchanged for a predetermined time” is not described in the specification. Referring to Fig. 12 of applicant’s specification, display processing in accordance with angle of rotation only happens after the delay time elapsed. When *the newly detected* second angle of rotation is the same as the first angle of rotation within the predetermined delay time, the program execution is still in the loop. Nothing happens and image rotation is not performed. Therefore, the metes and bounds of the coverage of at least base claim 1 cannot be ascertained.

The claim 1 also recites “the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen”. However, the specification describes at most “changes the posture of the information processing apparatus” and “an angular component detecting step of detecting an angular component in a plane parallel with the display surface”. That is the angular component as

Art Unit: 2628

disclosed is related to the plane parallel with the display surface, rather than the change of posture of the display screen or the posture of the display screen. The posture of the display screen is a vague term and the specification only describes to change the posture of the display screen.

To comply with the “written description” requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, an applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the “written description” inquiry, whatever is now claimed. *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Fed. Cir. 1991). For purposes of written description, one shows “possession” by descriptive means such as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention. *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Such descriptive means cannot be found in the disclosure for the inventions of the base claim 1.

Claims 2, 5-6 depend upon the claim 1 and are rejected due to their dependency on the claim 1.

The claim 3 recites the same claim limitation “when the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen detected by the posture detecting means remains unchanged for a predetermined time” as the claim 1 and therefore is subject to the same rationale of rejection set forth in the claim 1.

The claim 4 depends upon the claim 3 and is rejected due to its dependency on the claim 3.

The claim 7 recites the same claim limitation “when the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen detected by the detection processing step remains unchanged for a predetermined time” as the claim 1 and therefore is subject to the same rationale of rejection set forth in the claim 1.

The claims 8, and 11-12 depend upon the claim 7 and are rejected due to their dependency on the claim 7.

The claim 9 recites the same claim limitation “when the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen detected by the detection processing step remains unchanged for a predetermined time” as the claim 1 and therefore is subject to the same rationale of rejection set forth in the claim 1.

The claim 10 depends upon the claim 9 and is rejected due to its dependency on the claim 9.

The claim 13 recites the same claim limitation “when the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen detected by the detection processing step remains unchanged for a predetermined time” as the claim 1 and therefore is subject to the same rationale of rejection set forth in the claim 1.

The claims 16-17 depend upon the claim 13 and are rejected due to their dependency on the claim 13.

The claim 14 recites the same claim limitation “when the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen detected by the detection processing step remains unchanged for a predetermined time” as the claim 1 and therefore is subject to the same rationale of rejection set forth in the claim 1.

The claim 15 depends upon the claim 14 and is rejected due to its dependency on the claim 14.

The claim 20 recites the same claim limitation “when the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen detected by the detection processing step remains unchanged for a predetermined time” as the claim 1 and therefore is subject to the same rationale of rejection set forth in the claim 1.

The claims 21-23 depend upon the claim 20 and are rejected due to its dependency on the claim 20.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-17 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martinez et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,137,468 (hereinafter Martinez), and further in view of Hoshino et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,396,506 (hereinafter Hoshino), Robbins et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,326,978 (hereinafter Robbins), Tabata U.S. Patent No. 5,781,165 (hereinafter Tabata).

5. Re Claims 1 and 3:

Martinez teaches an information processing apparatus (e.g., figure 2) comprising:

A display screen (e.g., figures 4A-4D; column 3, lines 5-25);

Posture detecting means for detecting an angular component of a change of posture of the display screen (e.g., figures 5A-10; column 5, lines 5-39);

Displaying direction control means for displaying the plurality of separate images on said display screen, and for controlling a direction of display of the selected image (figures 5A-6C) by rotating the selected image according to a rotation of said display screen determined by said posture detecting means (e.g., figure 5A-10; column 4, lines 40-50; column 5, lines 40-67; column 6, lines 1-67; column 7, lines 1-20) and not rotating at least one of the other of the plurality images (See Figures 6A-6C wherein the block 602 is not rotated while the window 600 is rotated according to the orientation of the display screen).

It remains to be show that the cited references teach the claim limitation of “displaying direction control means for controlling a direction of display of the selected image by rotating the selected image according to the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen detected by the posture detecting means wherein said displaying direction control means controls the direction of display of said selected image by rotating said selected image when the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen detected by the posture detecting means remains unchanged for a predetermined time.”

However, Martinez discloses in Figs. 8-10 the claim limitation of “displaying direction control means for controlling a direction of display of the selected image by rotating the selected image according to the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen detected by the posture detecting means wherein said displaying direction control means controls the direction of display of said selected image by rotating said selected image when the angular

component of the change of posture of the display screen detected by the posture detecting means remains unchanged for a predetermined time.”

This is because Martinez discloses in Fig. 8 a rotate feature that allows “wait” until a selected amount of predefined movement is detected and there is a delay time by the execution of the block 804 before the program execution passes to the block 808 of updating system coordinates table to reflect tilt degree or the block 810 that all windows are redrawn using updated system coordinate table. Moreover, Fig. 10, Martinez discloses a side to side feature wherein the degree of tilt is detected, when the detected degree is within the defined trigger region, i.e., the angular component of the change of posture of the display screen as claimed remains unchanged for a defined amount time in block 1009, the process jumps to block 1010 and further jumps to the block 1022 or 1024 to arrange the windows.

Martinez discloses posture detecting means for detecting an angular component of a change of posture of the display screen (e.g., Martinez figures 5A-10; column 5, lines 5-39) and rotating the selected image according to a rotation of said display screen determined by said posture detecting means (e.g., Martinez figure 5A-10; column 4, lines 40-50; column 5, lines 40-67; column 6, lines 1-67; column 7, lines 1-20). Martinez discloses that sensor 702 provides numeric values a register and these values may represent the tilt of the hardware relative to a reference plane (Martinez column 5), suggesting that the tilt of the hardware or the posture of the hardware is stored as values in a register with addresses in the register addressing these stored values. Martinez thus at least suggests the claim limitation of “read addresses” read in accordance with the detected angular component. Robbins discloses in column 3, lines 39-67 a single clicking toggles between two pre-selected orientations and thus suggesting the pre-

Art Unit: 2628

selected orientations or postures of the display device are recorded in a register or memory for the image rotation by the single clicking.

Martinez is silent to “means for setting a first mode in which all of a plurality of separate images configured to be displayed on the display screen are to be rotated, a second mode in which a selected image of the plurality of separate images is to be rotated, and a third mode in which none of the plurality of separate images are to be rotated” and “means for selecting the selected image when the second mode is set.”

Hoshino teaches the claim limitation of “means for setting a first mode in which all of a plurality of separate images configured to be displayed on the display screen are to be rotated, a second mode in which a selected image of the plurality of separate images is to be rotated, and a third mode in which none of the plurality of separate images are to be rotated” (*See Figs. 40-46 in relation to Figs. 1-39 and the corresponding specification for a plurality of windows 350 shown in Figs. 45-46 are rotated in accordance with the operating buttons 300a-300d of Fig. 40 wherein the rotation of the images depend upon the selection of the operating buttons 300a-300d. Although Fig. 44 only shows one window, multiple windows can be found in Fig. 44 and column 19-20 wherein window B is displayed behind window A on a single display screen 2 and Fig. 46 wherein both windows A and window B are displayed on a single display screen 2. The windows A and B in the single display screen 2 are rotated together by means of the operating buttons 300a-300d and a particular window is rotated by means of the picture direction change buttons 354a-354d and the selector button 355 and the rotate button 356 of Fig. 43 to rotate a particular window 350 displayed on Fig. 46, no rotation takes place while no selection request whatsoever on the display screen window 2 or the windows A, B inside the display screen*

Art Unit: 2628

window 2 being made by the user to rotate the images. Moreover, each window has a single image or a plurality of images such as those shown in Fig. 7c). Hoshino also teaches “means for selecting the selected image when the second mode is set” (Selecting the image in window A when the second mode is set, i.e., when the rotation selection is placed on a particular window rather than being placed on the display screen 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated the Hoshino's selection means into the Martinez's display device because Martinez suggests selecting an image (600) to be rotated and selecting an image (602) not to be rotated and therefore Martinez suggests the claim limitation of the selection means for selecting an image (See Figures 6A-6C). Martinez teaches selecting an image object such as the window 600 (Figures 6A-6C) to be rotated and not selecting the other image object such as 602. The image objects 600 and 602 are separate image objects, i.e., the image object 602 just overlays on the window 600, but not a part of the window and therefore the image objects 600 and 602 constitute a plurality of image objects as claimed. Martinez therefore teaches rotating one of the plurality of the image objects while not rotating one of the plurality of the image objects.

One having the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would have provided a selection means so that a particular image can be selected to be rotated while other images remain unchanged in response to the display screen orientation (See Martinez Figures 6A-6C) and selection means so that user can manipulate the selected image object (Hoshino Figs. 40-46 and column 19-20; Robbins teaches the means of selecting an image displayed on a window of a plurality of separate images on a plurality of windows configured to

Art Unit: 2628

be displayed on the display screen; Robbins Figs. 1-2 and column 3-4 and Tabata column 10, line 65 to column 11, line 42).

One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated do this to accurately measure the angular posture of the display device and to supply the read addresses of the angular posture to be used to determine the display positions of the rotated image (Martinez figures 5A-10; column 5, lines 5-39) by a single clicking (Robbins column 3, lines 39-67).

Claim 2:

Claim 2 recites all the limitations of claim 1 and adds the limitation of a plurality of windows. Martinez clearly teaches a plurality of windows (e.g., figures 5A-5C; column 4, lines 40-50; column 5, lines 40-67; column 6, lines 1-67; column 7, lines 1-20).

Claim 4:

The claim 4 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claim 3 except additional claimed limitation that the displaying direction control means controls the direction of display of said image by rotating said image when the display screen remains rotated beyond the predetermined range after a predetermined time. However, Martinez further discloses the claimed limitation that the displaying direction control means controls the direction of display of said image by rotating said image when the display screen remains rotated beyond the predetermined range after a predetermined time (e.g., figure 10; column 4, lines 40-50; column 5, lines 40-67; column 6, lines 1-67; column 7, lines 1-20).

Art Unit: 2628

Claim 5:

The claim 5 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claim 1 except additional claimed limitation that the displaying direction control means controls the direction of display of said selected image by rotating said selected image according to the rotation of the display screen beyond a predetermined range. However, Martinez further discloses the claimed limitation that the displaying direction control means controls the direction of display of said selected image by rotating said selected image according to the rotation of the display screen beyond a predetermined range (e.g., figure 10; column 4, lines 40-50; column 5, lines 40-67; column 6, lines 1-67; column 7, lines 1-20).

Claim 6:

The claim 6 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claim 5 except additional claimed limitation that the displaying direction control means controls the direction of display of said selected image by rotating said selected image when the display screen remains rotated beyond the predetermined range after a predetermined time.

However, Martinez further discloses the claimed limitation that the displaying direction control means controls the direction of display of said selected image by rotating said selected image when the display screen remains rotated beyond the predetermined range after a predetermined time (e.g., figure 10; column 4, lines 40-50; column 5, lines 40-67; column 6, lines 1-67; column 7, lines 1-20).

6. Claims 7-12:

Art Unit: 2628

The claims 7-12 are a rephrasing of claims 1-6 in a method form, respectively. The claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1-6.

7. Claims 13-17:

The claims 13-17 encompass the same scope of invention as those of claims 1, 3-6, except additional claimed limitation of “the medium for storing the program”. However, Martinez further discloses the claimed limitation of “the medium for storing the program” (e.g., figure 2; column 7, lines 20-35).

Claims 20-23:

The claims 20-23 encompass the same scope of invention as those of the claims 1-6. The claims are rejected for the same reason set forth in the claims 1-6.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37